



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The five declensions, and similarly the four conjugations, are given all together. They are first developed by 'synthesis', and afterward the paradigms are given. The method is possible in nouns and regular verbs, but it is not even attempted in pronouns and irregular verbs¹. As a matter of fact, all the material for memorizing is, and necessarily must be, given in just about the same paradigmatic form in which it usually appears in beginners' books. The synthesizing is supplementary. *Too much* attention upon the *principia rerum* inevitably enervates the grasp of the essential facts, all-important for life as it is. *Sit omnibus rebus moderatio*. It is, moreover, to the reviewer, incredible that any class can study the five declensions as one and eventually be able to distinguish the forms. What we need for beginners is not a clearer or more accurate explanation of how things happen to be as they are, but a better pedagogical method for attaining the memorizing of those forms and facts which must be known before transfer of thought by written or printed language is possible. The methods of the centuries past have been found deficient in that they neglected the factor of attention: attention was enforced by external means; now it must be captivated by an internal charm. The error of this book is that it neglects the factor of convention: in any human affair many things are so just because they are so, because a certain people got started into a certain habit and then followed the line of least resistance. In some measure the history of forms and syntax may help to fix attention: but in general neither the moving causes nor the antecedent facts, but only the habits of the classical period, concern beginners. Otherwise we should teach Anglo-Saxon before English grammar.

Too much theorizing leads to juggling with facts: cf. e. g. p. 13, "in the pronunciation of *princip*, the lips would remain closed forever unless 'e' were sounded". Again, on p. 148, indicative and subjunctive future conditions are distinguished as being, respectively, "admitted (in accordance with the facts)" and "imaginary"; on p. 156 the statement implies that *cum*-causal takes the indicative if on one's own authority; on p. 143 result is said to be expressed by the subjunctive because "the result depends upon the main verb"; on p. 156 the same explanation is applied to *cum*-clauses (where the usage of classical times was almost pure convention). On p. 159 we read "Nearly all subordinate clauses are expressed by the subjunctive"—could any more fatal idea be gotten into a boy's head? (see also above.) There are

some apparently careless misstatements. So on p. 129 the ablative of degree of difference is made to = 'than'; on p. 129 *plenus frumento* is given as the regular construction; on p. 121 the genitive depending on *causa* is said to be objective; on p. 133 indirect discourse is said to be used "after all verbs or expressions followed by the introductory word 'that' in English"; on p. 161 by implication it is stated that *utinam* is not regularly used with the imperfect optative subjunctive.

The parts of speech are treated in the order of the grammars, and syntax follows. Extensive knowledge of English grammar is presumed. The exercises consist of twenty-five to one hundred phrases or sentences in each lesson (there are only fifty lessons). There is no English-Latin until syntax is begun. The sentences are nearly all taken, almost unchanged, from the first book of Caesar. When forms occur which the student can not understand, the translation is given in parentheses. The general vocabulary must be used from the beginning. The lesson vocabularies contain only 245 words; but the vocabulary of the exercises consists of 966 words, of which 722 occur five or more times in Caesar I-V; 110 occur less than five times in high-school Latin¹. There are misprints: *fugierunt* (p. 138), *propinquus* (180), *socer-eri* (183), and mistakes in numbering: par. 79 and 158, IV. There is unnecessary repetition (pp. 9 and 11, 89 and 94, 111 and 112) and some inconsistent statements (§§ 7, 40). Some words are printed twice in the vocabulary. *Itemque* is misplaced. The hyphen is inconsistently omitted in compounds of *sub* and *trans*. The quantity of vowels is not marked except here and there in the exercises, in the vocabulary, and in some paradigms.

BARCLAY W. BRADLEY.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Helladian Vistas. By Don Daniel Quinn. Published by the author, at Yellow Springs, Ohio (1909).

The alert teacher of Greek will welcome any means by which he can broaden his horizon and come into more intimate touch with the life and thought of the Greek people, both in classic and in more recent times. No American, probably, is so well fitted as Dr. Quinn to give us an intimate view of Greek lands and the Greek people of today, and to make the proper connection between classic and modern conditions. He has, by long residence and extensive travel in Greek lands, made himself thoroughly familiar with the modern Greeks, especially the common people, and this intimate familiarity has made itself apparent on every page of this entertaining book. Myth and history, topography and archaeology, crowd each other on these pages, all helping to bring out clearly the present conditions and their relations to the greater past.

¹ Almost every one of these, however, occurs at least once in B. G. I.

¹ So it is comparatively easy to trace the pedigree of each use of the accusative case from the supposed original meaning, it is more difficult in the dative (starting from the 'rest' idea), and fails utterly in the genitive and ablative. In the book before us the entire syntax of subordinate clauses is developed from the statement that the subjunctive "expresses something, at the time referred to, following the main verb, . . . something not at the time a fact". The connection is for the most part highly artificial, sometimes wholly lacking, and sometimes false (e.g. the association of *quoniam*-clauses with verbs of fearing). *Cum*-clauses and all indicative clauses are relegated to parenthetical notes.

The most interesting and instructive parts of the book treat mainly of Greek lands outside the beaten track of 'personally conducted' parties. The chapters on the various Ionian Islands and on the Maniats of southern Laconia are cases in point.

Father Quinn shows great interest, insight and fairness in his treatment of religious questions. The 'survivals' of ancient myth and ritual are continually indicated.

The brief but vivid account of the siege of Mesolonghi in the Greek Revolution is far superior in interest to the annalistic narrative of Howe, or to the scholarly but prosaic account of Finlay. It rather recalls the story of the novelist Xenos in his 'Andronike', translated by Grosvenor.

The most serious criticism to be passed upon Dr. Quinn's book grows out of his familiarity with the modern Greek pronunciation and his fondness for that pronunciation. This is a matter of the personal equation, of course, and it is within an author's technical right to use what are, to the readers to whom the book appeals, outlandish and repellent expressions, but *cui bono*?

In the first place, such a scheme is almost impossible of consistent execution, as Dr. Quinn's book abundantly proves. *Eu* in Greek names he regularly writes *ev*, thus giving us *Zeus*, *Elevisis*, *Peiraecevs*, and even *Akrokeraevnian*, the last being an Anglicized form of a Latinized Greek word. Will Dr. Quinn tell us that this spelling represents any actual pronunciation of the English word at any period? Possibly *Elevisis* represents a some-time truth, but why not go to the length and use *Levsina* as the Greeks of today do? If we insist upon *Peiraecevs*, why not transliterate exactly and write *Peiraievs*? Dr. Quinn writes *Bathy* and *Bolos*, but *Omer Vrioni*; why not *V* in all if we are to indicate the modern sounds? *Phaeaks* (not *Phaiaks*) for our old friends the Phaeacians, *Evmolpids*, *Levktra*, all raise our ire, for they simply introduce a new element of confusion into the already sufficiently perplexing question of spelling and pronunciation. Many of these words are thoroughly Anglicized, and no one, it seems to us, is justified in thus making a bad matter worse. And if bad for the Greek student who can "see the point", how much worse for the non-Greek reader who needs a glossary of Quinnisms to get him back into his former world.

But this is Father Quinn's little fad, and we gladly forgive him for it, in view of the instruction and pleasure he has given us in Helladian Vistas.

GEORGE A. WILLIAMS.

KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN.

CORRESPONDENCE

In sending you a brief rejoinder to Professor Greene's reply to my criticism of his paper upon Latin Word-Order, I would not occupy the position

of the proverbial woman who must have the last word, but I want to express regret for my slip in not noticing that *fiebat* and not *factus est* stands in the passage from Cicero's Milo, though, as Professor Greene suggests, the blunder does not invalidate my argument.

Will you spare me space for another remark or two? What Professor Greene says about the position of "the stronger or more significant word" seems to show that we mean different things by the term 'emphasis'. According to him these more significant words are *eo ipso* the more emphatic ones, while I hold that emphasis is quite independent of the connotative force of a word.

Again, Professor Greene says truly that 'we must note carefully the Latin form of expression'. It is on this account that it seems to me futile to try to settle any question of emphasis in Latin by setting before elocutionists unfamiliar with that language a literal translation of a Latin sentence. This might work if one could reproduce in English all the shadings of the thought in Latin sentences as well as one generally can those of the thought expressed in German or French or other modern languages, by translating nouns by nouns, verbs by verbs, adjectives by adjectives, etc. To deny emphasis to a Latin word because one would not emphasize its syntactical equivalent in an English sentence translated word for word from the Latin appears to me entirely unwarrantable.

I should like to show how such crude indications of emphasis as 'I am passing my FOUR and eightieth year', and 'But I come to the farmers, etc.', do not at all express the very slight degrees of emphasis which a Greenoughite sees in such sentences, but it would take too long, and your readers are doubtless weary of the subject already. I hope they will all read Professor Meader's article in The School Review for April.

NOTE

HORACE'S ESTIMATE OF HELIODORUS IN SERM. 1. 5. 3.

rhetor comes Heliodorus
Graecorum longe doctissimus.

The individual alluded to probably cannot now be identified. "The hyperbole is intended and is playful", comments Wickham. "Probably a friendly overestimate, as no account of him has come down to us with all his learning", observes Greenough. "An exaggerated expression characteristic of the mock-heroic style which Horace adopts in several parts of this satire, . . . a form of wit common in modern times", writes Rolfe. Among the multitude of similar comments on this passage, we may be surprised that what seems an obvious explanation is not emphasized, that Horace is speaking in bitter